



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/930,119

08/15/2001

Bruce A. Schofield

120-174

9946

34845

7590

09/05/2008

Anderson Gorecki & Manaras LLP

33 NAGOG PARK

ACTON, MA 01720

EXAMINER

BOUTAH, ALINA A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2143

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/05/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

handerson@smmalaw.com  
officeadmin@smmalaw.com  
cmorrisette@smmalaw.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/930,119	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SCHOFIELD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> ALINA N. BOUTAH	<b>Art Unit</b> 2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 39-49 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/6/08</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

This action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed May 22, 2008. Claims 1-49 are pending in this application. Claims 39-49 have been withdrawn as a result of a restriction election. Applicant is reminded to cancel claims 39-49 upon allowance of this application.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on August 6, 2008 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

### ***Specification***

The cross-reference to related application numbers (see specifications pages 1 and 2) must be filled.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

Applicant has amended claims 1-13 to recite a computer program product stored on a computer-readable medium to overcome the 35 USC § 101 rejection. While the "computer-readable medium" is mentioned in the specification (page 35, line 27), it is not explicitly defined. It is highly suggested that the claims be amended to recite

Art Unit: 2143

"computer- **storage** medium" in order to clarify any ambiguity. See specification, page 36, lines 14-16.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-14, 16-27, 29, and 31-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,681,232 issued to Sistanizadeh et al in view of USPN 7,133,403 issued to Mo et al.

Sistanizadeh et al. combined with Mo et al. teach claims:

1. An optical service agent (Sistanizadeh: col. 8, lines 27-33) for managing communication services for a user in an optical communication system in which the user lacks at least some network information related to the services, the optical service agent comprising:

a user-to-network interface (UNI) (Sistanizadeh: abstract: user interface) for interfacing with an optical communication network (Sistanizadeh: abstract: "IP-Over Ethernet on fiber networks;" col. 3, lines 33-51: optical fiber access ring interconnecting switches) including signaling to a network device having network information related to

Art Unit: 2143

the communication services (Sistanizadeh: col. 3, lines 18-33; col. 9, lines 37-39), including network topological information (Sistanizadeh: col.2, lines 36-67; col. 3, lines 18-30), to cause the network device to signal an indication of group membership to other devices in communication with the optical communication network (Sistanizadeh: col. 14, lines 6-18: advertising routes to peers on the internet); and optical service logic for obtaining a new optical communication path from the optical communication network via the network device by signaling through the UNI, the network device selecting the communication path based at least in-part on the user network or application requirement and the network information related to the communication services and managing said optical communication path for the user (Sistanizadeh: col. 18, lines 17-35; fig.4; "Summit48 supports OSPF (Open Shortest Path First). OSPF is a routing protocol that determines the best path for routing IP traffic over a TCP/IP network." Col. Col. 27, lines 16-31, "In the example of FIGS. 3 and 4, the latency agent 127 performs trace route operations on one leg going from its location at the M-POP switch 43 to each of the G-POP switches 73, 75 within the same region 90 (see FIG. 3). For this purpose, the latency agent 127 would launch ICMP queries addressed to the switches 73, 75 at the boundary of that regional network. The agent 127 determines the path based on addresses of the switches along the path that respond and determines the latencies for each hop, of the legs going to the G-POP switches around the backbone distribution ring 50. The same latency agent launches ICMP queries to customer equipment 31 at the various customer locations served through the access ring 30, to perform trace route operations on each second leg going from its location to a

Art Unit: 2143

respective customer location. The agent 127 determines path and the latencies for each hop, of the legs going to the customer equipment around the access ring 30. “).

However, Sistanizadeh does not explicitly teach managing said optical communication path for the user without exposing the network topological information to the user, whereby the user need not have the network information in order to obtain a new optical communication path.

In an analogous art, Mo teaches managing optical communication path for the user without exposing the network topological information to the user whereby the user need not have the network information in order to obtain a new optical communication path (Mo: col. 3, lines 3-13). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to manage communication path for users without exposing the network topological information to the user in order to prevent cross contamination and intrusions between users and the network system (Mo: col. 3, lines 9-13).

3. The optical service agent of claim 1, further comprising auto-discovery logic for automatically discovering peer users (Sistanizadeh: col. 14, lines 6-18: advertising routes to peers on the internet).

4. The optical service agent of claim 3, wherein the auto-discovery logic comprises an advertisement mechanism for sending and receiving peer information (Sistanizadeh: col. 14, lines 6-18: advertising routes to peers on the internet).

5. The optical service agent of claim 4, further comprising a peer database for storing peer information (Sistanizadeh: co1.14, lines 6-36)

6. The optical service agent of claim 1, further comprising peer authentication logic for authenticating peer users (Sistanizadeh: fig. 11, peer authenticating logic peer users 187, 90, 135, 133).

7. The optical service agent of claim 1, further comprising peer-to-peer signaling logic for communicating with peer users (Sistanizadeh: fig. 11; col. 14, lines 6-36).

8. The optical service agent of claim 7, wherein the optical service logic coordinates communication services with peer users via the peer-to-peer signaling logic (Sistanizadeh: fig. 11).

9. The optical service agent of claim 1, wherein the optical service agent comprises an application component and a network component (Sistanizadeh: col. 35, lines 16-33 - "The system 351 also includes one or more input/output interfaces for communications, shown by way of example as an interface 359 for data communications via the LAN at the NOC 135, and from that LAN to the out-of-band signaling network and preferably to the production network. The interface 259 could include a modem for telnet sessions, but preferably comprises one or more network interface cards, such as Ethernet cards. The communication interface 359 may include

Art Unit: 2143

virtually any other appropriate data communications device. The physical communication links may be optical, wired, or wireless (e.g., via satellite or cellular network). In accord with aspects of the invention, the computer system 351 connects to a local area network, for communication with other operations support systems, such as the web server 111 and the order manager 147, at one of the NOC locations 135. Through the LAN and/or another interface card, the system 107 also has communications connectivity both to the production network (for SNMP communications and the like) and to the NOC router for the out-of-band (OOB) communications.").

10. The optical service agent of claim 9, wherein the application component and the network component are situated within the user, and wherein the network component implements the UNI for interfacing with the optical communication network (Sistanizadeh: figure 12: 351).

11. The optical service agent of claim 9, wherein the application component is situated within the user and the network component is situated within the optical communication network, and wherein the application component and the network component communicate via the UNI (Sistanizadeh: figure 12: 351).

12. The optical service agent of claim 9, wherein the application component and the network component communicate via a control interface, and wherein the network



Art Unit: 2143

component interfaces with the optical communication network via the UNI as a proxy for the application component (Sistanizadeh: figures 1 and 2).

13. The optical service agent of claim 1, further comprising an application program, interface (API) for interfacing with a user application (Sistanizadeh: figure 1: 113).

Claims 14 and 16-25 are similarly rejected as in claims 1 and 3-13.

Claim 26 is similar to claim 1, therefore is rejected under the same rationale. Claim 26 furthermore recites a controller for providing optical communication services. The element is taught by Sistanizadeh in col. 35, lines 16-33

27. The apparatus of claim 26, wherein the optical service agent implements a user-to-network interface (UNI) for interfacing with the controller (Sistanizadeh: abstract: user interface).

Claim 29 is similarly rejected as in claim 1.

Claims 31-33 are similarly rejected as in claims 10-12.

34. The system of claim 29, further comprising a second network user coupled to the optical communication network, said second network user comprising a second optical service agent (Sistanizadeh: figure 3).

35. The system of claim 34, wherein each of said optical service agents comprises autodiscovery logic for automatically discovering the other of said optical service agents (Sistanizadeh: col. 14, lines 6-18: advertising routes to peers on the internet).

36. The system of claim 34, wherein each of said optical service agents comprises peer authentication logic for authenticating the other of said optical service agents (Sistanizadeh: fig. 11, peer authenticating logic peer users 187, 90, 135, 133).

37. The system of claim 34, wherein each of said optical service agents comprises peer-to-peer signaling logic for coordinating communication services with the other of said optical service agents (Sistanizadeh: col. 14, lines 6-18: advertising routes to peers on the internet).

38. The system of claim 29, further comprising a second network user coupled to the optical communication network, said second network user excluding an optical service agent (Sistanizadeh: figure 4).

Art Unit: 2143

Claims 2, 15 and 28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,681,232 issued to Sistanizadeh et al in view of USPN 7,133,403 issued to Mo et al. in further view of USPN 7,095,956 issued to Levandovsky et al.

Sistanizadeh et al. combined with Mo et al. and Levandovsky et al. teach claims: 2, 15, 28 and 30. Neither Sistanizadeh nor Mo teaches wherein the optical communication network comprises an automatically switched optical/transport network (ASON), and wherein the UNI comprises an ASON UNI. However, this feature is known in the art as evidenced by Levandovsky (col. 1, lines 35-42). at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ ASON because by definition, ASON is divided into sub-networks, and within these networks, paths are capable of delivering acceptable quality of service, thereby reducing undesirable optical transmission impairments (Levandovsky: col. 1, lines 35-42).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant argues that the cited combination is improper because (a) there cannot be a motivation to combine where the combination defeats the operation of the teaching; and (b) the combination does not actually yield the claimed invention. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

(a) the combination of Sistanizadeh and Mo does not defeat the operation of the teaching. The claims recites in part: "... and managing said optical communication path for the user **without exposing** the network topological information to the user." Support for this limitation is found in the specification, page 22, lines 8-14 which recites:

"The hybrid/proxy architecture is similar to the distributed flooding architecture, and therefore has many of the same advantageous and disadvantageous characteristics as the distributed flooding architecture. However, because the OSS rather than the OSA-N floods the advertisement, the OSS does not need to **"leak"** topological information to the OSA-enabled user. Therefore, there is no confusion of the separation between the NNI and the UNI."

It is clear from the disclosure that by not **exposing**, the network topological information is in fact not **leaked** to users. The term "leak" implies that something is unintentionally disclosed or unauthorized.

Sistanizadeh, col. 18, lines 9-47, teaches "Essentially, the SLM application plane 150 sits on top of the network plane 10 (FIG. 7). The **application has an understanding of the network topology**. The SLM application plane 150 collects data from various agents in the agent plane 170, and it populates one or more databases with collected information about network operations. The SLM application plane 150 has the business logic that works on the database, and **through its user interface provides requested information** about the health of the network to customers and to network operations staff."

It is clear from the cited passage that it is the **application** that has an understanding of the network topology, not the user. Furthermore, the network topology is stored in a database. Although the user has access to the information, the user has to **request** it. It does not "leak" topological information to the user as argued by Applicant. Therefore, the teaching of Sistanizadeh does not defeat the operation of the teaching.

(b) the combination does yield the claimed invention:

In view of Supreme Court Decision in *KRS International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. -, 82 USPQ2d 11385 (2007), the Supreme Court stated that the Federal Circuit erred when it applied the well-known teaching-suggestion-motivation (TSM) test in an overly rigid and formalistic way. According to the Supreme Court, the TSM test is one of a number of valid rationales that could be used to determine obviousness. It is **not** the only rationale that may be relied upon to support a conclusion of obviousness.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no motivation to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Sistanizadeh does not explicitly teach managing said optical communication path for the user without

Art Unit: 2143

exposing the network topological information to the user, whereby the user need not have the network information in order to obtain a new optical communication path. In an analogous art, Mo teaches managing optical communication path for the user without exposing the network topological information to the user whereby the user need not have the network information in order to obtain a new optical communication path (Mo: col. 3, lines 3-13). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to manage communication path for users without exposing the network topological information to the user in order to prevent cross contamination and intrusions between users and the network system (Mo: col. 3, lines 9-13).

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2143

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALINA N. BOUTAH whose telephone number is (571)272-3908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (9:00 am - 5:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tonia L.M. Dollinger can be reached on 571-272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alina N Boutah/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2143